IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 20486 of 2005

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KSHITIJ R.VYAS

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA

==========

1 Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2 To be referred to the Reporter or not ?

3 Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4 Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5 Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

BHAILALBHAI MANIBHAI PATEL & 1 - Petitioner(s)

Versus

SPECIAL LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER & 2 - Respondent(s)

==========

Appearance :

MR GM AMIN for Petitioner(s) : 1 - 2,2.2.1
NOTICE SERVED BY DS for Respondent(s) : 1, 3,
MR SP HASURKAR A.G.P. for Respondent(s) : 2,

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KSHITIJ R.VYAS
and
HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA

Date : 17/01/2006

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE AKSHAY H.MEHTA)

1. Rule. Mr. S.P. Hasurkar learned A.G.P., waives service of rule on

behalf of the respondents. At the request of the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties the matter is taken up for final disposal today itself.

2. By order dated 16th December, 2005, we have given interim direction to respondent no. 2 to consider and take appropriate decision on the draft award submitted to it by respondent no. 1. The said decision was required to be taken on or before 17th January, 2006. Today, Mr. Hasurkar learned A.G.P., on instructions from Mr. S.K. Rathod who is personally present in the Court, states that the draft award of respondent no. 1 has been duly approved by respondent no. 2, on the conditions enumerated in the communication addressed to respondent no. 1 dated 16th January, 2006 by the Deputy Secretary, Revenue Department, Government of Gujarat. Mr. Hasurkar produces copy of the said communication, which is now ordered to be taken on the record of this petition.

3. In view of the same, grievance of the petitioners does not survive. Hence this petition is required to be disposed of. Accordingly, this petition stands disposed of. Rule is discharged.

[Kshitij R. Vyas, J.]

[Akshay H. Mehta, J.]

/phalguni/